

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,874	02/08/2001	Mikio Ihama	0042-0437P-SP	6673
2292	7590 08/25/2005		EXAMINER	
BIRCH STE PO BÓX 747	EWART KOLASCH &	WALKE, AMANDA C		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1752	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				1D_			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments		09/778,874	IHAMA, MIKIO				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Amanda C. Walke	1752				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communicati or Reply	on appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence addre	iss			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicate period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day to period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by the property of	FION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a retion. In a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON by statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this comm ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.			
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n 02 June 2005.					
2a)□		This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims			•			
5)□	Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application of the above claim(s) is/are we claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-18,21 and 22 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 19 and 20 is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	ithdrawn from consideration.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.					
10)	0)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection	to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by		· · ·	• •			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Elee the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in A e priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Sta	age			
Attachmen	t(s)						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)	•			
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/ r No(s)/Mail Date)/Mail Date´. formal Patent Application (PTO-15, 	2)			

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the amendment filed 6/2/2005. In light of the amendment, the rejection of record has been dropped and a new rejection follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-18, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brust et al (6,100,019) in view of Nishikawa et al (6,007,977) and Wen et al (5,536,632).

Brust et al disclose a silver halide photographic material comprising high bromide {111} tabular grains having a high chloride epitaxy. The grains are preferably silver iodochlorobromide and contain silver iodide in an amount of less than 10 mole %, and silver chloride in an amount of less than 10 % as well (column 3, line 53 to column 4, line 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the emulsion using any amount within these ranges. Additionally, the inventive grains comprise either 0.75 mol % or 1.2 mol % iodide. The epitxial deposits may constitute only 0.1 % of the total silver, thus the chloride may be added in an amount as low as 0.1 mol %. The grains account for at least 90 %, most preferably greater than 97 % of the total grain projected area, have a thickness of less than 0.2 microns, preferably less than 0.07 microns, an ECD of less than 6 microns, and an aspect ratio of at least 5 (column 5, lines 30-57). The grains may be hexagonal (column 7, lines 34-50). The grains contain high chloride epitaxies in the corners of the grains. The examples prepare grains having 6 epitaxial

deposits, one in each corner of the grain, which implies that the grains formed by the examples are hexagonal grains. The pBr during emulsion preparation is preferably adjusted to be between 3.0 and 3.8, after the temperature has been set between 20 and 60 degrees C, and from looking at the inventive examples the temperature is preferably 40 degrees C (column 6, lines 45-67). The exemplified grains also contain one or more dislocation lines at the epitaxial junctions, demonstrating that the grains may have dislocation lines at the apexes of the grains. The material comprising the emulsion is coated on a support (column 10, lines 15-18).

Although the material does not specifically refer to the COV of the ECD of the grains, since the reference teaches that the emulsion should be monodisperse, that the COV would inherently be very low and would be less than less than the 30% and 20 % claimed given that it is most preferable for greater than 97 % of the emulsion to be comprised of the preferred grains which would have an ECD within the claimed range. The reference fails to disclose specific information on the edge lengths of the hexagonal grains.

Nishikawa et al disclose a silver chloroiodobromide {111} emulsion comprising hexagonal grains containing dislocation lines in the apexes of the grains (column 4, lines 1-46). The reference teaches that it is preferable for hexagonal grains to have a ratio of the longest side to the shortest side of 2 or less (column 3, lines 11-26), and further teaches that a monodisperse emulsion will have a low COV of the ECD (15 5 or less) of the grains.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the monodisperse high bromide {111} hexagonal grain emulsion of Brust et al using hexagonal grains having a ratio of the longest side to the shortest side of 2 or less given that it is taught to be preferable by

Art Unit: 1752

Maruyama et al with reasonable expectation of achieving an emulsion having high sensitivity and graininess.

Wen et al disclose ultrathin silver iodobromide {111} grains similar to those of the other references, but demonstrates both high silver chloride epitaxies and silver chlorobromide epitaxies, wherein both bromide and chloride are present in the epitaxy, and the choride contant is less than 50 %. These grains exhibit increased contrast and decreased granularity (see table XV in column 41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the monodisperse high bromide {111} hexagonal grain emulsion of Brust et al in view of Nishikawa et al and modifying the epitaxies to be the AgIBrCl epitaxy of Wen et al with reasonable expectation of achieving an emulsion having increased contrast and decreased granularity.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 19 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art of record fails to teach or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the material of the present claim 1 or 2 wherein the pBr of the emulsion is at 40 °C is not more than 3.5.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amanda C. Walke whose telephone number is 571-272-1337.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 5:30-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly can be reached on 571-272-1526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Amanda C Walke

Examiner

Art Unit 1752

ACW

August 20, 2005